UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,422	10/22/2007	John L. Telford	002441.00189	9353
	7590 11/06/200 ACCINES AND DIAC		EXAMINER	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY R338			DEVI, SARVAMANGALA J N	
P.O. BOX 8097 Emeryville, CA 94662-8097			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			1645	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/568,422	TELFORD ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	S. Devi, Ph.D.	1645
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04/1</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This 3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examina 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct the option of the second s	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicat Pority documents have been receiven Tau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Lack of Unity

- 1) Claim 21 has been canceled.
 - Claim 8 has been amended.
 - Claims 1-20 are under prosecution.
- 2) As provided in 37 CFR 1.475(a), a national stage application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention"). Where a group of inventions is claimed in a national stage application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

The determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternatives within a single claim. See 37 CFR 1.475(e).

- 3) As provided in 37 CFR 1.475(b), a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories:
 - (1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or
 - (2) A product and process of use of said product; or
- (3) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product; or
- (4) A process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process; or
- (5) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process.

 Otherwise, unity of invention might not be present. See 37 CFR 1.475(c).
- 4) Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

- I. Claims 1-17, drawn to an immunogenic composition comprising a combination of two GBS antigens including GBS 80 antigen or a fragment thereof, or a polypeptide having 50% sequence identity.
- II. Claim 18, drawn to a method for the therapeutic or prophylactic treatment of GBS infection comprising administering an immunogenic composition of invention I.
- III. Claims 19 and 20, drawn to a method for the manufacture of a medicament comprising combining GBS80 antigen with at least a GBS polypeptide antigen.
- 5) Inventions I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons. The special technical feature of the first claimed invention is an immunogenic composition comprising a combination of two GBS antigens including GBS 80 antigen or a fragment thereof. However, such a composition was already suggested in the art at the time of the invention. For example, CHIRON CORPORATION (WO 2004/041157 A2 – Applicant's IDS) taught a composition comprising a combination of GBS 80 antigen having the amino acid sequence of SEO ID NO: 2 or a fragment thereof, and GBS 322 antigen or a GBS saccharide antigen. See claims and pages 4 and 5. The antigen combination in the composition can consist of 2-5 GBS antigens and includes GBS 80, GBS 104, GBS 276, GBS 91, GBS 184 etc. Therefore, the special technical feature of invention I does not define over the prior art. Although the product of invention I, and the method of using the product of invention II and the method of making the product of invention III is a permitted combination under PCT Rule 13.2, in the instant case, since the product of invention I is already disclosed in the art, the special technical feature is not a unifying feature. Technically, the absence of special technical feature permits the separation of method of using the product or method of making the product from the product itself.
- 6) The Office has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. *Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder*. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of an invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the lack of unity/restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

- 8) This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.
 - (I) GBS 80 fragment species: (a) SEQ ID NO: 2; (a) SEQ ID NO: 3; (b) SEQ ID NO: 4; (c) SEQ ID NO: 5; (d) SEQ ID NO: 6; (e) SEQ ID NO: 7; (f) SEQ ID NO: 8; and (g) SEQ ID NO: 9. See claims 8 and 9. Claims 1-7 and 10-13 are generic.
 - (II) Two to thirteen combination GBS antigen species as recited in claims 10-13, 15-17 and 20. Claims 1-9, 14, 18 and 19 are generic.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention or species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions have unity of invention (37 CFR 1.475(a)), applicant must provide reasons in support thereof. Applicant may submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. Where such evidence or admission is provided by applicant, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- **10)** Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600, AU 1645 by facsimile transmission. The Fax number for submission of amendments, responses and/or papers is (571) 273-8300, which receives transmissions 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. The transmission of such papers by facsimile must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30, November 15, 1989.
- Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAG or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.Mov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAA system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (in USA and CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control No. 10/568,422

Art Unit: 1645 November 2008

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to S. Devi, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0854. A message may be left on the Examiner's voice mail system. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7.15 a.m. to 4.15 p.m. except one day each bi-week, which would be disclosed on the Examiner's voice mail system.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Robert Mondesi, can be reached on (571) 272-0956.

/S. Devi/ Primary Examiner AU 1645

November, 2008